

Ronald Charles Vrooman general delivery Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

FILED 6 MAR '17 12:01 USDC-ORP

On Oregon IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON seeking jurisdiction!

Ronald Charles Vrooman )

Case No. 3:17-cv-00138-KI

Petitioner Pro Se' )

Reply to the denial of Habeas Corpus,  
formerly known as Traverse; I object  
to and deny the denial of my Habeas  
Corpus.

v. )

JOHN T. MERCER; PAT  
GARRETT; T. KEMPTON and  
Garr M. King and Michael  
Mosman of courthouse 740

I am, ronald charles vrooman a peaceful man on the Land of Oregon, not the state of Oregon, this state or any other permutation of Oregon, am under threat, duress and coercion. Previously I was incarcerated under color of law and currently I am under bench probation, with my right to bear arms Infringed, my right to travel infringed with a privilege, several of the Bill of Rights guarantees denied. Unlawfully. Court Document attached. I am still seeking lawful relief from the orders of John T. Mercer, and remedy for the incarceration, fines, fees and probation issues and traffic issues of the Beaverton Municipal Court by this document. I request review by the Court for violations of my Substantive and Procedural 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment Due Process Rights.

DISC available transcript soon.

In order to state "a meritorious claim [pursuant to Section 1983], a plaintiff must allege that he was deprived of some constitutional right." Cramer v. Crutchfield, 648 F.2d 943, 945 (4th Cir. 1981). .FOWLER V. VALENCOURT North Carolina Court of Appeals 108 N.C. App. 114 (N.C. Ct. App. 1992)

I restated and stated them above.

The State Actors involved have made no attempt to prove Jurisdiction in this case.

*with 37 pages  
of evidence*  
*[Signature]*  
*3/3/17*



Ronald Charles Vrooman general delivery Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

\*Title 5 USC 556 (d) proof of Jurisdiction must appear on the Record prior to the commencement of any proceedings. [t]he Oath of office is a quid pro quo contract cf [U.S. Const. Art. 6, Clauses 2 and 3, Davis Vs. Lawyers Surety Corporation., 459 S.W. 2nd. 655, 657., Tex. Civ. App.] in which clerks, officials, or officers of the government pledge to perform (Support and uphold the United States and state Constitutions) in return for substance (wages, perks, benefits). Proponents are subjected to the penalties and remedies for Breach of Contract, Conspiracy cf [Title 18 U.S.C., Sections 241, 242]. Treason under the Constitution at Article 3, Section 3., and Intrinsic Fraud cf [Auerbach v Samuels, 10 Utah 2nd. 152, 349 P. 2nd. 1112, 1114. Alleghany Corp v Kirby., D.C.N.Y. 218 F. Supp. 164, 183., and Keeton Packing Co. v State., 437 S.W. 20, 28]. Refusing to live by their oath places them in direct violation of their oath, in every case. Violating their oath is not just cause for immediate dismissal and removal from office, it is a federal crime. Federal law regulating oath of office by government officials is divided into four parts along with an executive order which further defines the law for purposes of enforcement. 5 U.S.C. 3331, provides the text of the actual oath of office members of Congress are required to take before assuming office. 5 U.S.C. 3333 requires members of Congress sign an affidavit that they have taken the oath of office required by 5 U.S.C. 3331 and have not or will not violate that oath of office during their tenure of office as defined by the third part of the law, 5 U.S.C. 7311 which explicitly makes it a federal criminal offense (and a violation of oath of office) for anyone employed in the United States Government (including members of Congress) to "advocate the overthrow of our constitutional form of government"

"Every State law must conform in the first place to the Constitution of the United States, and then to the subordinate constitutions of the particular state; and if it infringes upon the provisos of either, it is so far void." Houston v. Moore, 18 US 1, 5 L.Ed 19 (1840).

The obligations of a contract are impaired by a law which renders them invalid, or releases or extinguishes them ( Sturges v. Crowninshield, supra, pp. 197, 198) and impairment, as above noted, has been predicated of laws which without destroying contracts derogate from substantial contractual rights. HOME BLDG. L. ASSN. V. BLAISDELL U.S. Supreme Court 290 U.S. 398 (1934)

I do not understand, nor do I see the necessity for, the metaphysical distinction between policies that are themselves unconstitutional and those that cause constitutional violations. See ante, at 823-824, and n. 7. If a municipality takes actions — whether they be of the type alleged in Monell, Owen, or this case — that cause the deprivation of a citizen's constitutional rights, § 1983 is available as a remedy. OKLAHOMA CITY v. TUTTLE•471 U.S. 808, 832 (1985)

"In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel \* \* \*." 28 U.S.C.A. § 1654.

Ronald Charles Vrooman general delivery Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

"The Constitution does not force an attorney upon a defendant." Adams v. United States, 317 U.S. 269, 279, 63 S. Ct. 236, 242, 87 L.Ed. 268. DUKE v. UNITED STATES, 255 F.2d 721, 724 (9th Cir. 1958) The Beaverton Municipal court did. It is on the record and objected to and filed as wrong.

Our rule is generally that jurisdictional discovery should be allowed unless the plaintiff's claim is "clearly frivolous." Nehemiah v. The Athletics Congress, 765 F.2d 42, 48 (3d Cir. 1985), citing Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee v. L'Union Atlantique S.A. D'Assurances, 723 F.2d 357, 362 (3d Cir. 1983) MSL AT ANDOVER, INC. V. AMERICAN BAR ASS'N United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit. 107 F.3d 1026 (3d Cir. 1997)

**131.035 When departures, errors or mistakes in pleadings or proceedings are material. No departure from the form or mode prescribed by law, error or mistake in any criminal pleading, action or proceeding renders it invalid, unless it has prejudiced the defendant in respect to a substantial right. [1973 c.836 §4]**

United States Constitution and the common law authorities of Haines v Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, Platsky v. C.I.A. 953 F.2d. 25, and Anastasoff v. United States, 223 F.3d 898 (8th Cir. 2000) relying on Willy v. Coastal Corp., 503 U.S. 131, 135 (1992), "United States v. International Business Machines Corp., 517 U.S. 843, 856 (1996), quoting Payne v. Tennessee, 501 U.S. 808, 842 (1991) (Souter, J., concurring). Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647, American Red Cross v. Community Blood Center of the Ozarks, 257 F.3d 859 (8th Cir. 07/25/2001).

In re Haines: pro se litigants (Plaintiff is a pro se litigant) are held to less stringent pleading standards than BAR registered attorneys. Regardless of the deficiencies in their pleadings, pro se litigants are entitled to the opportunity to submit evidence in support of their claims. In re Platsky: court errs if court dismisses the pro se litigant (Plaintiff is a pro se litigant) without instruction of how pleadings are deficient and how to repair pleadings. In re Anastasoff:

#### TAKE HEED

I do lawful not legal and my best effort must be accepted. I am civil in my approach and withhold honor as defined by Black's 6<sup>th</sup> as I am dealing with an unknown courts that have not proven their bona fides. This need not be respectful as that word is not in Black's 6<sup>th</sup>.

Traverse see Black's 6<sup>th</sup> page 1500:

#### Preliminary Statement:

My first friend/2<sup>nd</sup> Chair Richard L. Koenig filed this Habeas Corpus and he did it while I was in the Washington County Jail. I appreciate his effort and Reply to the denial with a form of traverse also known as a Reply to the Denial of Habeas Corpus.

On the affirmative for the plaintiff:



Ronald Charles Vrooman general delivery Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

The right to travel is guaranteed by the Constitutions of the United States of America in any of the forms currently in publication. Whether it is from the Constitution of United States Inc or the Original Government not the corporate governance or the one from Manhattan and the Netherlands. This is in response to the NO Constitutional issue statement. "A license when granting a privilege, may not, as the terms of its possession, impose conditions which require the abandonment of constitutional rights." Terral v. Burke Construction Co.,

Olmsted v. United States, (1928) 277 U.S. 438

"Crime is contagious. If the Government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy." The Accardi Doctrine come to mind.

The right to bear arms is also an inalienable right guaranteed by our founding documents. Named Organic in the USC. This is in the probation portion of John T. Mercer's sentencing. A class C misdemeanor does not rise to the power to deny a Constitutional right, unusual punishment.

36 months probation to the Beaverton Municipal Court Judge John T. Mercer was obtained in error as my rights were not guaranteed as he agreed on the record, that the First Law of the Land was the Constitution of/for the (u)United States of America and the second law of the Land of Oregon was the Constitution of Oregon. FRC vs. GE 281 U.S. 464, Keller vs. PE 261 U.S. 428, 1 Stat. 138 -178) "Judges do not enforce statutes and codes. Executive Administrators enforce statutes and codes. John T. Mercer never proved his bona fides to Judge.

The denial on page three at the bottom; the sentence is relatively short. You do 20 days in Washington County jail without proper medication and treatment at 78 years of age, then say that. Then the sentence is still going with bondage for 36 months and the loss of my second amendment guarantee of right to bear arms. I challenge the assertion on relatively short. Garr M. King made that assertion. I would like to see some proof. I can provide proof of cruel and unusual punishment by letters and documents about medical abuse with the knowledge and consent, by their silence and ignorance is no excuse, if you are the one making the action then you are responsible for the action. Trying, sentencing, Incarceration without proof of jurisdiction filed into the record. That is three errors when reading the law.

Unlike attorneys members of the British Accredited Registry the BAR and required to have a FARA card, I am not required to quote case law and perform to the Judges' whim. I only need to be a man on the land and those opposing me need to prove territorial jurisdiction. It was not done. This is void to be known as such with no redeeming features, ab initio.

Then I am told by knowledgeable people that I can only use one claim at a time or the court gets confused and may grant jurisdiction because of something else I said. That is ridiculous to me. If

Ronald Charles Vrooman general delivery Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

a judge cannot handle what I can cope with, I have the wrong judge. Besides they must contact me to clear up any errors or issues, so says the law.

Ronald Charles Vrooman is the trustee of the Private Membership Association RONALD CHARLES VROOMAN and under title IV rule 17b without mala in se crime the public corporate governance has no jurisdiction or authority over me. That information was provided to the Beaverton Municipal Court and is on the record. Accardi Doctrine again obey your own rules.

Another reason for this whole thing to be declared wrong from the start and just piling one error on another and the judge saying, "if you don't like it appeal, if you say jurisdiction once more you will be in contempt, you are a person and I will try you as a person." So said John T. Mercer on the record and I paraphrase very closely to the quote.

I researched and have a copy of the title documents on the Mark Hatfield Building 1000 SW 3<sup>rd</sup> in Portland. United States of America, code for we the people, is on the title; not US inc or DC Municipal Court. The GSA rents space to the courthouse 740 and the DOJ and the US Marshall. That is code for you have no jurisdiction territorially over me. There is jurisdiction over the Beaverton Municipal Court. Correct their errors with a Habeas Corpus.

I submitted my document on my status into the court UC 7945181 records and recorded it with the city of Beaverton recorder and copied the prosecutor. I know who I am and proved it with un rebutted affidavit. I also have a birth certificate in cursive sign by people now deceased. Therefore I am the last man standing and none can refute me.

The medical document from my primary care physician is also attached as are the final document for territorial jurisdiction to the prosecutor T. Kempton and the final document prior to sentencing to the Beaverton Municipal Court. And the BMC attempt to obtain jurisdiction by hearing a document that stands, as it is expose facto, I went to jail, one cannot un-ring the bell. If you are confused call me, just like the law says.

The attached Demurrer proves all that is needed for proof of the Constitutional right to travel. The SCOTUS has ruled many times that states, the state, this state may not take a right and turn it into a privilege and then charge a fee or deny the right.

The statement that about exhausting his available state remedies being a reason to dismiss is in error. See the denial of a stay from Washington County Circuit Court Judge Upton. Also see the request for dismissal from the Beaverton Municipal Court. The Demurrer entered into the Beaverton Municipal court that was denied. Denial is not an option on Demurrer.

Therefore, it is obvious that remedy in many forms was attempted and denied or refused.

Ronald Charles Vrooman general delivery Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

168 Next comes the argument of appeal and post conviction processing. When my first friend filed  
169 this, it was for Habeas Corpus from the Federal Court due to several factors. Taking things in a  
170 chronological order is how Richard and I are working through the legal maze set before us.

171 First comes Habeas Corpus. That is available immediately from Federal Court. It was filed at  
172 once and denied while I was still in jail. How could any of the other options been available?  
173 They were not. An appeal from jail requires the inmate to relinquish his document for  
174 photocopy. Thereby, placing his appeal in jeopardy by giving it to those incarcerating him, in  
175 this case employees of Pat Garrett. Then to mail from jail it must be done in the envelopes  
176 provided by the jail. Thus not being able to enter the First class USPS system with a ROUND  
177 stamp from the inmate's hand. Neither is certified return receipt requested available. These are  
178 all civil rights and due process violation 18 UCS 3571.

179 From reading the DENIAL from Garr. M. King; where is the signed document whereby Richard  
180 or Ronald agreed to a Pro Tem? There is none. I have the unsigned form mailed to me.  
181 Therefore, how does Garr. M. King find the authority to have jurisdiction? There is none.  
182 However, in color of law, a denial was issued. That must be in error.

183 Therefore, hunt up an Article III judge to grant the Habeas Corpus and void all the charges in UC  
184 7945181 and related traffic issues of the Beaverton Municipal Court. Should you take more than  
185 3 weeks, your response will be termed late and a violation of due process and civil rights. The  
186 next step is Human Rights Violations in International Court

*without state of Oregon  
without county of Washington  
without city of Beaverton*

*Ronald Charles Vrooman  
sworn in the United  
States of America*

*under penalty of perjury signed and affirmed before me 3/1/2017*

*MM SR 3/1/17  
Notary Public - State of Oregon*



*certified copy  
3/2/17*



503 846060

To: Suzanne M. Upton Judge  
Washington County Circuit Court

From: Ron Vrooman

I need a stay of execution  
on fines and probation at the  
Beaverton Municipal Court.

I am filing my appeal in Salem  
Thursday 2/16/2017. A motion to  
stay will take a minimum of 5 weeks

Therefore: Request for Humanitarian  
stay of execution on fines and probation,  
temporarily, say 120 days, or appeal.

It took all my money to bail out  
prior to trial. \$2,000.00 on 20K for  
traffic. One was a class 'C'. The  
court took that.

I did 20 days in WA, CO. Jail. Now  
I need a stay.

PLEASE HELP.

R. Vrooman  
Ron Vrooman  
503 641 8375  
FAX & PHONE

2.14.17  
MOTION IS DENIED  
Suzanne Upton  
Judge Suzanne Upton

**RONALD CHARLES VROOMAN**

non-resident alien c/o general delivery Beaverton, Oregon Non-Domestic [ 97005 ]

Tim Kempton Prosecutor city of Beaverton 4755 SW Griffith Dr

January 23, 2017

**RE: Beaverton Municipal Court case # 7945181 Copy of Filings to Complete and Exhaust Private Administrative Remedy In Regards to Misapplication of Statutes or otherwise****RECEIVED****RECEIVED**

Dear \_Tim Kempton:

JAN 23 2017

JAN 23 2017

This communique is sent to you in regards to the above matter.

Under necessity, and per my Right to exhaust my "Private Administrative Remedy" in this matter, to obtain the necessary evidence and related information in regards to the so-called charges, please find enclosed a more formal 'Notice and Declaration in Challenge to the Jurisdiction.'

Beaverton Municipal City Attorney's Office

As such, due to this very time sensitive matter, under necessity, I require you to produce and provide me with all necessary 'Proof of Jurisdiction', whether subject matter, personum, political, contractual or otherwise, and/or produce and make available to me all documents on file or obtainable from the State of Oregon, County of Washington and/or the Beaverton municipal corporation which would demonstrate that I am are a party to any social compact or contract which can be demonstrated to operate to confer any contractual, controlling, insurable, lawful, legal, pecuniary, regulatory, or any other interest in my being and/or property to the benefit of the county, State or City of Beaverton.

Under necessity, you are given ten days to provide and produce all necessary evidence of jurisdiction in and for the above case matter, as sentencing is around the corner.

Since I have challenged jurisdiction at least 4 times before, with no 'evidence' coming forward, should you fail or refuse to produce all evidence of jurisdiction at this time, by your refusal, failure and therein your silence, your dishonor and silence will be accepted as your 'silent tacit agreement' that no such jurisdiction exists per the above case in the Beaverton Municipal Court, that the case is a 'nullity' & 'void' and you agree to the engagement of fraud in this matter, in collusion and conspiracy with others in this matter and you agree to be the liable, culpable and responsible party, along with others, via a scheme to cause me great injury per your actions per this matter, re; 'constitutional impermissible application of statutes' and otherwise and you agree to pledge all your property, assets and that of your spouse and you agree to subjugation and subrogation as you have agreed to misapplication of statute, misrepresentation of law, commissions of various frauds against me. Thanking you advance per this matter, I remain,

Sincerely,

~~without~~ STATE OF OREGON  
~~without~~ COUNTY OF WASHINGTON  
~~without~~ CITY OF BEAVERTON

*under penalty of perjury*  
 signed and affirmed before me on January 23, 2017

*[Signature]*  
 Ronald Charles Vrooman - private man,  
 one of the Joint Tenants of the sovereignty  
 of Oregon in the United  
 States of America



*MISE 1/23/17*





Ronald Charles Vrooman General Delivery, Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

RECEIVED

JAN 23 2017

City Attorney's Office

## MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE CITY OF BEAVERTON

4755 SW Griffith Dr.

## COUNTY OF WASHINGTON, STATE OF OREGON

RONALD CHARLES VROOMAN  
CES TUI QUI TRUST

Defendant,

Case Number (s): UC 7945181

UI 2071731

Ronald Charles Vrooman, in propria  
person sui juis, a Sentient Man,  
Wrongly accused, one of the Joint  
Tenants of the sovereignty.

V

STATE OF OREGON  
Plaintiff

ADMINISTRATIVE AND  
JUDICIAL NOTICE  
AS TO AGREEMENT BY THE  
STATE OF OREGON OF NO  
PROOF OF JURISDICTION VOID  
CASE - VOID JUDGMENT  
REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL

I am, ronald charles vrooman a peaceful man on Oregon, not the state of Oregon, under threat,  
duress and coercion.

**131.035 When departures, errors or mistakes in pleadings or proceedings are material.** No  
departure from the form or mode prescribed by law, error or mistake in any criminal pleading,  
action or proceeding renders it invalid, unless it has prejudiced the defendant in respect to a  
substantial right. [1973 c.836 §4]

The prosecutor Tim Kempton has not proven territorial jurisdiction in this case. I bring the  
formal claim: territorial, personam and subject matter jurisdiction against a man, ronald charles  
vrooman, must be proven or there is no case.

On and for the record I have asked this court to name the type of law form, i.e. admiralty,  
maritime, equity, martial, commercial, constitutional, common law, ecclesiastical, or any other  
form of law unbeknownst to me. That information has been denied. I must make my best guess.

Proof of jurisdiction, as repeatedly (on or about 20) requested, must appear on the record of the  
court. Once the court has knowledge that subject matter jurisdiction or any jurisdiction is  
lacking, the court (meaning the judge John T. Mercer) has no discretion but to dismiss the action.

RECEIVED

JAN 23 2017

Beaverton Municipal

PC: Vrooman

Ronald Charles Vrooman General Delivery, Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

IT IS DECLARED: that RONALD CHARLES VROOMAN shall hereby do business as a private membership association under its own constitution and bylaws on this 8<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2017 6423531(1-12,13,14-17) I am the trustee of this private membership association. This is under Title IV rule 17 b,3,A, the 1<sup>st</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> amendments, I am the trustee, Ronald Charles Vrooman.

Therefore, the flesh and blood man Ronald Charles Vrooman trustee of the private membership association seeking to reach harmony, doing business as the private membership association RONALD CHARLES VROOMAN, bought tags for the plates to the Volvo and applied for a privilege permit to operate license, had a DEQ test and paid for it. All of these documents were provided to the court and prosecutor Tim Kempton.

There is no contract between the peaceful man and the STATE OF OREGON. Only between the Private Membership Association, I am the trustee, and the corporate governance.

There is the threat of jail time for the class "C" misdemeanor fail to display or possess operators license, which is cruel and unusual punishment for a 78 year old man, Ronald Charles Vrooman in ill health. This is proven by the attached letter from Sarah Goodlin M.D., VA Medical Center Portland, Oregon.

There is a Bail set at \$20,000.00, 10% required for release. This is excessive. There it is insufficient reason to suspect a peaceful man, Ronald Charles Vrooman of flight, who is in good standing, of good morals, a 28 year member of the community and a member of the Beaverton Oversight Committee.

Two Counter claims for jurisdiction were filed into UC 7945181 and ignored.

That due to the above, this case is a nullity (null & void), as the State has failed to prove jurisdiction and any such judgment from this court is a void judgment.

That, the State, by and through the Prosecutor, failed and/or refused to respond to or rebut

Ronald Charles Vrooman's "NOTICES and multiple CHALLENGES TO THE JURISDICTION

and DEMAND THAT ALL CHARGES BE DISMISSED" in a timely manner (within 30 days)

and is in dishonor/default, of failing or refusing to prove jurisdiction and therein by their silence

acquiesce, therefore the Prosecutor has accepted and agreed to all enumerated points in all

document challenging jurisdiction .By their silence they acquiesce and that the State of Oregon

lacks jurisdiction, territorial, personum or otherwise, in any manner over Ronald Charles

Vrooman and such is now deemed 'fact' in the record of this matter.

Ronald Charles Vrooman General Delivery, Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

That, Ronald Charles Vrooman 'accepts for value' "The unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen united States" AKA; "The Declaration of Independence" as a declaration and Trust to apply to him.

Proof of jurisdiction, as repeatedly requested, must appear on the record of the court. Once the court has knowledge that subject matter is lacking, the court (meaning the judge John T. Mercer) has no discretion but to dismiss the action. Failure to dismiss the action means the court is proceeding in clear absence of all jurisdiction and subjects the judge John T. Mercer to suit.

That, per paragraphs above, the State has acquiesced by not responding to any filing, that Ronald Charles Vrooman is not a party to the of Oregon Constitution and is not named in State statutes, as Ronald Charles Vrooman is a private man upon the land, a 'U.S. Constitution 1787 - Article 4 - American Public Citizen, and is one 'Official Credit authorizing Officer' and having unalienable Rights and those expressed in the "Declaration of Independence", of Rights of; "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness", with all such Rights as "upheld, protect(ed) and defend(ed)" by and through each and all 'officers' of the State of Oregon including but not limited to the 'officers' of the "City of Beaverton Police ", a municipal corporation ...to uphold, protect and defend such Rights.

That, all officers of the State of Oregon and City of Beaverton have violated their 'Oath of Office' to their 'compact/Constitution' as to the 'Bill of Rights', as such operates upon such 'officers' by and through said 'oath' as applied in this matter against Ronald Charles Vrooman.

Also filed into this case was, applying to State of Oregon, which includes but not limited to City of Beaverton, a municipal corporation, which terminates anything Ronald Charles Vrooman may have signed, under threat, duress and coercion, or disclosure of nexus, liability or otherwise.

As such, in the failure and/or refusal of the State of Oregon, thru the prosecutor in this case, to prove jurisdiction, for either State of Oregon or City of Beaverton 1) there was no 'offenses' 2) that Warrant(s) issued against the Private Membership Association named; RONALD CHARLES VROOMAN and/or the man; Ronald Charles Vrooman are null & void for lack of jurisdiction, 3) that the Arrest warrant, the following Arraignment on 10/31/2016 and the "not



Ronald Charles Vrooman General Delivery, Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

87 guilty' pleas entered are also Null & Void as no probable cause, no crime, no right of action,  
88 when no jurisdiction proven.

89 That, under necessity, Ronald Charles Vrooman, accepts for value the 'oaths of office' of all  
90 'officers' pertaining to this matter, including but not limited to the Governor of the State of  
91 Oregon, the Mayor and Council and Beaverton Police, the Prosecutor(s), the Judge(s) of the  
92 Beaverton Municipal Court in their lawful & legal duty to uphold their 'oath of office' as to the  
93 Rights, titles and interest of the sentient man; Ronald Charles Vrooman and not to be compelled  
94 into a foreign court and of a foreign jurisdiction ...to be compelled to the liability of  
95 'constitutional impermissible application of statute(s)', into an undisclosed 'Trust' matter where  
96 Ronald Charles Vrooman is the 'Trustee in the Private Membership Association of RONALD  
97 CHARLES VROOMAN.

98 That due to the above, this case is a nullity (null & void), as the State has failed to prove  
99 jurisdiction and any such judgment from this court is a void judgment.

100  
101 That, this court is a foreign court of a foreign jurisdiction as it displays a Maritime/Admiralty  
102 National Flag and the State of Oregon, by and through the Prosecutor, failed to bring in and  
103 exhibit the 'Contract' showing bona fide signature of Ronald Charles Vrooman, that gives this  
104 foreign court jurisdiction over Ronald Charles Vrooman aside from any contract with the State of  
105 Oregon, or that Ronald Charles Vrooman is a party to the State of Oregon Constitution and is  
106 named in State statutes.

107 That, based upon the fact of 'silent tacit agreement' by the State of Oregon that no such  
108 jurisdiction exists over the private sentient man; Ronald Charles Vrooman and such 'agreement'  
109 being the Bond in this matter and all other facts, statements, or otherwise as stated herein, and

Ronald Charles Vrooman General Delivery, Beaverton, Oregon [97005] 503 641 8375  
ronvrooman38@gmail.com

the now rebutted; Documents and Declarations are 'fact in the record of this matter', Plaintiff is barred from moving forward as stated; no probable cause, no crime, no injured party, no right of action, with no jurisdiction proven ...and therefore this case is Null & Void by said silent tacit agreement and any so-called judgment that would operate against Ronald Charles Vrooman would be a void judgment.

That, Ronald Charles Vrooman, wrongly accused private man reserves all Rights at all times and waives no Rights at any time including his time at \$2,000.00 per hour not including monetary damages for all injuries.

I, Ronald Charles Vrooman aver that any alleged Oregon judge must take compulsory administrative and judicial notice of all the Documents filed and Declarations, enumerated points, citations, any footnotes and all information added by reference in this matter. Based upon the above facts, Ronald Charles Vrooman herein requests the court upon its own motion to abate and dismiss this case in the interest of justice and set at liberty Ronald Charles Vrooman.

Dated this 23 day of JANUARY, 2016 7 REV

*without* STATE OF OREGON

*without* COUNTY OF

*without* WASHINGTON

CITY OF BEAVERTON

under penalty of perjury

SIGNED and Affirmed before me on JANUARY 23, 2017

Ronald Charles Vrooman

in the United States of America



*MM SE 1/23/17*